

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated April 4, 2008, in which claims 1, 4-18 and 20-23 were rejected, and in response to the Advisory Action that was mailed on June 17, 2008. With this Amendment, claims 1, 8 and 18 have been amended, claims 21-23 have been canceled, and the remaining claims are unchanged. Claims 2-3 and 19 were previously canceled. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims in view of the above-amendments and the following remarks.

I. CLAIM OBJECTIONS

In section 4 of the Office Action, claims 1, 8 and 21 were objected to due to informalities. With this Amendment, claims 1 and 8 have been amended to correct the informalities in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions and claim 21 has been canceled. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

II. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

In section 6 of the Office Action, claims 1, 4-18 and 20-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In general, the Office Action suggests that the limitation "without multiple instances of user intervention" in the independent claims is not defined/described in the specification. With this Amendment, Applicants have replaced that language in independent claims 1 and 18 with "in response to the generalized request." Claim 21 has been canceled. Support for the amendments to the independent claims 1 and 18 can be found, for example, in FIG. 2 of the application and the corresponding description of FIG. 2 in the specification. A portion of the description of FIG. 2 (page 12, lines 1-19, of the specification) is included below.

More specifically, report object 210 provides a generalized request (non-database/non general-ledger-specific request), formed using information entered by the user into report designer and viewer 208, to uniform interface 206 which, based on information included in the generalized request, accesses data from general ledger database 204 and returns the accessed data to report object 210. Uniform interface 206 essentially includes a plurality of general ledger access methods 212 that translate the generalized request into a specific query, which typically includes sequential

query language (SQL) statements, that retrieves the necessary data from general ledger 204.

In accordance with the present invention, the retrieved or accessed data is stored in staging table(s) 214 before it is returned to report object 210. Data returned to report object 210 is displayed to the user via designer and viewer 208.

The above section indicates that a report object 210 provides a generalized request, and the uniform interface 206 returns the accessed data in response to the generalized request. Also, the above section describes how the uniform interface 206 access the data from the general ledger database 204, stores it in staging table(s) 214, and returns the accessed data to the report object 210 in response to the generalized request.

Page 16, lines 6-14, of the specification, which are included below, describe how an account staging table is used to process a request.

The purpose of account staging table 402 is to represent all accounts that are needed for specific rows of the report. (See *SetAccounts* in Appendix A). Instead of joining the entire chart-of-accounts table 408 against balance table 410 of general ledger 204, the requested accounts are placed in a staging table and thereby decrease the size and complexity of the join required by typical prior art general ledger reporting systems.

In the above section, the requested accounts are the accounts in a generalized request from a report object. The above section is one example of how a generalized request is responded to and satisfied.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that there is adequate support in the specification for the claim amendments. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

### III. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

In Section 9 of the Office Action, claims 1, 4-18 and 20-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins, U.S. Publ. No. 2002/0065744 in view of Thompson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,668,253. Further, in Section 10 of the Office Action, claim

23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins in view of Thompson and further in view of Bakuya et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,680,614.

In Collins, to perform a query that employs a temporary table, two requests are required: one to retrieve information from a database into the temporary table, and another to retrieve data from the temporary table and return it to the web server. In contrast, the claimed invention only uses a generalized request. Thus, Collins does not teach or suggest all the elements of the independent claims 1 and 18. As noted above, independent claim 21 has been canceled. Thompson and Bakuya do not overcome the deficiencies of Collins. Thus, independent claims 1 and 18 are believed to be allowable. In fact, the Examiner indicates, in the continuation sheet of the Advisory Action, that amendments to independent claims 1 and 18, which were also included in a response that was filed on June 4, 2008, overcome the cited references. Additionally, the dependent claims are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from the allowable independent claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims 1, 4-18 and 20. Favorable action upon all claims is solicited.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,  
WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /Alan G. Rego/  
Alan G. Rego, Reg. No. 45,956  
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319  
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312